



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.          |  |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| 10/594,278  | 09/26/2006  | Yoshiaki Watanabe    | 063029              | 3371                      |  |  |
| 38834   | 7590        | 02/26/2009           | EXAMINER            |                           |  |  |
| WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP<br>1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW<br>SUITE 700<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20036 |             |                      |                     | DOERRLER, WILLIAM CHARLES |  |  |
| ART UNIT  |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                           |  |  |
| 3744  |             |                      |                     |                           |  |  |
| MAIL DATE   |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                           |  |  |
| 02/26/2009  |             | PAPER                |                     |                           |  |  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/594,278             | WATANABE ET AL.     |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | William C. Doerrler    | 3744                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9-26-2006</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                         |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the first stack being “disposed in the longest linear tube portion among the plurality of linear tube portions” of claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Currently all the vertical portions are shown having the same length.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, “longest linear tube portion” is confusing, as both vertical tubes are disclosed as having the same length. The other claims depend from claim 1, so they are unclear due to their dependency. In claim 1, “stand relative to the ground” would be clearer as -vertical--.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swift et al (6,032,464).

Swift et al show in figure 13C a thermoacoustic cooling system with long vertical passages 222,238, connected by shorter horizontal passages, with the vertical passages containing a hot stack 216 surrounded by a hot and cold heat exchanger and

a cold stack 234 surrounded by a hot and cold heat exchanger. The specification refers to zero mass flux (a standing wave) and states (column 7 line 5, for example) that acoustic power will circulate (traveling wave). In regard to claim 2, figure 13C clearly shows the ratio of the short side to the long side within applicants' claimed range.

Claims 1,2,5-7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swift et al (6,164,073).

Swift et al disclose in figure 4 a thermoacoustic refrigerator having long vertical legs containing stacks (32,34) bounded by heat exchangers (26,36,28,38) and connected by shorter horizontal legs. Column 4 lines 26-37 discusses the two waves in the system. Figure 4 shows the claimed spacing of parts as claimed in claims 2 and 5. In regard to claim 7, see speakers 12 and 14 in figure 4. In regard to claim 13, series arrangement of coolers is discussed in line 22 of column 7.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2,3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of the above Swift et al patents.

Each of the Swift et al patents disclose applicants' basic inventive concept, a thermoacoustic cooler with longer vertical legs connected by shorter horizontal legs with the longer legs containing stacks and heat exchangers, substantially as claimed with the exception of the placement of disclosed parts. The placement of disclosed parts is considered a matter of ordinary design choice, unless applicant can show criticality or new, nonobvious results derived from the placement. IN the instant case, switching the heat exchanging stacks so that the hot stack is lower than the cold stack is seen as a matter of design choice that will not appreciably change the functioning of the device, as long as the proper spacing of the stacks is maintained relative to the wavelength. One of ordinary skill would recognize the importance of the heat transferring stacks relative to the wavelength, making the relationship of claim 6 well known to provide the most efficient cooling in a thermoacoustic cooler.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,404,296 in view of either Swift reference. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current claims differ only in specifying that the vertical legs of the circuit are longer than the horizontal legs connecting them and associated spatial relationships of the components due to such an arrangement. Swift shows such a configuration to be old in the thermoacoustic cooling art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention from the teaching of the Swift et al patents to use a configuration having longer vertical legs containing the stacks and heat exchangers to provide an efficient transfer of the acoustic energy to thermal energy.

Claims 1-7,12 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 10/594,278, as represented by 2007/0221367 In view of either Swift patent. The '278 application claims the same inventive concept a thermoacoustic device with specific spacing between components, with the exception of

using the device as a refrigerator. Swift provides a teaching to convert thermoacoustic devices between refrigeration and heating modes based on the placement of the components and the frequencies used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention from the teaching of Swift to provide cooling using the thermoacoustic system of the '277 application by removing heat from what is the energy input heat source of a heat producing device to provide efficient refrigeration.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hofler shows in figure 4, a thermoacoustic device with longer horizontal passages connected by vertical passages.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Doerrler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William C Doerrler/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744

WCD